

### **REMARKS**

This responds to the Office Action mailed on August 25, 2004.

No claims are amended, canceled, or are added. As a result, claims 1–26 are now pending in this application.

#### **Information Disclosure Statement**

Applicant submitted an Information Disclosure Statement and a 1449 Form on May 27, 2004. Applicant respectfully requests that an initialed copy of the 1449 Form be returned to Applicant's Representatives to indicate that the cited references have been considered by the Examiner.

#### **Objection to the Drawings**

The drawings were objected to as not showing every feature of the invention specified in the claims. More specifically the objection stated that “a bus,” “a display” “an external memory” and “a processor” as claimed in claim 17 were not shown in a drawing. Applicant respectfully traverses the objection for the reason started below.

Applicant points out that FIG. 7, which was submitted with the corrected formal drawings filed June 19, 2003<sup>1</sup>, illustrates those elements of originally filed claim 17. Applicant, in the amendment sent June 19, 2003 added a brief description of Figure 17 to the specification<sup>2</sup>. Adding the figure a description of it in the patent specification does not add “new matter” to the application since claim 17, as filed disclosed the now explicitly described invention<sup>3</sup>. Reconsideration of the prior amendment to the drawings and the specification and withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested..

---

<sup>1</sup> The approval was indicated on the summary sheet at paragraph 11 of the Office Action Summary of the Office Action of August 6, 2003.

<sup>2</sup> The Examiner at page 6 paragraph 7 of the Office Action onf August 6 acknowledged the amendment but deemed it moot in view of new anticipation and obviousness rejections.

<sup>3</sup> MPEP 608.04 states that in evaluating the proscription of 37 CFR 1.121 (f) against new matter, applicant may rely upon the original claims as well as the specification and drawing as filed if their content justifies it.

Double Patenting Rejection

Claims 1-26 were provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over claims 12-15, 18-20, and 24-26 of co-pending Application No. 10/187,513. That patent has now issued as US Patent 6,856,016.

A Terminal Disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) is enclosed herewith to overcome the rejection based upon that patent.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney ((612) 373-6970) to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,

STEPHEN W. MONTGOMERY ET AL.


By their Representatives,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.  
Attorneys for Intel Corporation  
P.O. Box 2938  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402  
(612) 373-6970

Date

February 24, 2005

By



Charles E. Steffey  
Reg. No. 25,179

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: MS Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on this 24th day of February 25.

Name

Amy Moriarty

Signature

